

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 to 6 and 8 to 20 under 35 USC §112 for allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In response thereto, the base claims have been amended to delete the expression "continuously" from the claims to leave "filling". However, the claim limitation "hiding any portion of said source image outside of said bounding frame" has been kept in the claims. Support for this can be found at paragraph 66 of the application.

It is respectfully submitted that the Applicant's specification is thus sufficient to support the claim limitations of "filling" and "hiding any portion of said source image outside of said bounding frame".

Claims 2 to 6 and 8 to 20 were also rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

Base claims have been amended to delete the expression "continuously" from the claims. It is believed this rejection is now moot.

As to the meaning of the claim language "hiding", the Examiner is again directed to paragraph 66 of the specification which explains the meaning of this expression.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 9 and 11 have been amended to replace "boundary" with —bounding—in order to keep the claim language consistent.

Claims 2 to 6 and 8 to 20 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over BARTON et al. in view of HERMANSON and SHEASBY et al. Newly submitted base claims include the limitation that when the pointing device is positioned at a corner or size of the bounding

frame, this sets an anchor point at an opposite side or corner of the bounding frame and that during the cropping operation, a portion of the image that is adjacent the anchor point remains substantially fixed. Support for this limitation can be found on Figure 8 of the present application.

In Figure 8, the Examiner will note that the sun which appears at the right hand side of the image in the various steps, remains substantially fixed during the cropping operation. Support can also be found for this in paragraph 73 which is a sample implementation of the technique where the anchors are set.

It is respectfully submitted that this feature is not taught or even suggested by combination of the three references cited by the Examiner. Specifically, former claims 17 to 18 introduce the limitation where the scaling of the images centered about the corner of the bounding frame opposite to that are being manipulated. SHEASBY, Figures 1 to 12 and column 5 clearly does not teach such limitation. There is no mention or suggestion that a portion of the image opposite the handle is fixed.

It is respectfully submitted that the present amendment places the application in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/761,315
Amdt. dated August 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 24, 2006

Should any issues remain outstanding, and which could be resolved by way of a telephonic interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBIC

By 
Louis-Pierre Gravelle
Reg. No. 44,429
Tel.: (514) 987-6242

LPG/lid/jw

Date: August 10, 2006